

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	LICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO		
10/678,249		10/03/2003	Gary William Yeager	133816-1	6-1 2016		
23413	7590	11/10/2005		EXAMINER			
CANTOR		•	TRUONG, DUC				
55 GRIFFIN BLOOMFIE				ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	,			1711			
					DATE MAIL ED 11/10/2005		

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/678,249	YEAGER ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Duc Truong	1711				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE in the maje to available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO , cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communic BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-8,10,11,13-26 and 29-32</u> is/are pen	ding in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.	•				
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-8, 10-11, 13-26 and 29-32</u> is/are rejected.						
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	epted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	•	• • •				
11)[_]	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-15	2.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document: application from the International Bureau	s have been received. s have been received in A rity documents have beer	Application No	3			
* S	see the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	received.				
Attachment		∧ □	Current (DTC 442)				
2) Notice 3) Information	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/678,249

Art Unit: 1711

DETAILED ACTION

Per conversation with Applicant on October 31, 2005, Applicant wants to know why the Office action mailed on September 19, 2005 has been withdrawn.

The Advisory action has been mailed on 8/29/05 and Applicant filed the Amendment AF on 9/9/05 and Examiner has only 10 days to respond to this Amendment and an Office action has been issued on 9/19/05. However, an RCE has been filed three days later, 9/22/05, the status of the case has been changed and the 9/19/05 Office action is no longer valid and hereby withdrawn in order for RCE to be entered into the system. Therefore, a new ground of rejection is cited herein:

Claims 1-8, 10-11, 13-26 and 29 –32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merfeld et al.

The reference discloses a curable composition comprising a functionalized poly(arylene ether) see [0014], which has been capped by the structure [0015 et seq.], maleic anhydride [0031], an olefin alkyl (meth)acrylate copolymer such as ethylene ethyl acrylate copolymer [0081, 0084], an alkenyl aromatic monomer (see Abstract, [0047-0049] may comprise polybutadiene [0068].

The composition may further comprising an additive selected from flame retardants, lubricants, antioxidants, thermal stabilizers, ultraviolet stabilizers, pigments, dyes, antistatic agents---[0119], suitable to form articles [0133-0134].

The disclosure of the reference differs from the instant claims in that it does not disclose the claimed olefin alkyl (meth)acrylate excluding ethylene ethyl acrylate (C2).

Application/Control Number: 10/678,249 Page 3

Art Unit: 1711

However, said copolymers (C2) has the same functionality with other ethylene (C1 and C3-C8) acrylate copolymers in the same composition due to the same mechanism to form the same or similar products. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select the ethylene C2 acrylate copolymer from the reference to replace ethylene C1 and C3-C8 acrylate copolymers in the claimed composition since they have been shown to be effective in a similar system and thus would have been expected to provide adequate results. There is no showing of unexpected results derived from said use.

The Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 9/09/05 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-8, 10-11, 13-26 and 29-32 based upon a specific reference applied under 35 U.S.C. 103 as set forth in the last Office action because: fails to set forth facts related to the invention.

Because reference is a joint Patent Published Application to Applicant and another, then an unequivocal declaration under 35 CFR 1.132 must be filed by S that he conceived or invented the subject matter disclosed in the application publication and relied on in the rejection. In re DeBaun, 687 F.2d 459, 214 USPQ 933 (CCPA 1982). However, said declaration is insufficient to show the relevant portions of the reference originated with or were obtained from applicant in that neither relevant dates nor conception have been detailed. MPEP 716.10.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA

Application/Control Number: 10/678,249

Art Unit: 1711

1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-8, 10-11, 13-26 and 29-32 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,22, and 28-35 of U.S. Patent No. 6,878,782. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the only difference is the instant claim 1 is the combination of claims 1 and 22 of the reference in that the ethylene ethyl acrylate copolymers in claim 22 is included in a polymeric additive in claim 1 of the reference.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine claims 1 and 22 of the reference to form at least claims and seq. of the instant claims since they have been shown to be effective in a similar system and thus would have been expected to provide adequate results. There is no showing of unexpected results derived from said selection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-1081. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/678,249 Page 5

Art Unit: 1711

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DUCTRUONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER